

HOW HOMEOWNERS PURCHASED IMPROVEMENTS AND DISCOVERED THEY HAD ACQUIRED NEW MORTGAGES

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak too highly of the investigative work of the two reporters on the Washington Post whose articles on home improvement rackets have been so revealing. These articles provide additional evidence of the need for effective consumer credit protection legislation. Following is the article which appeared in this series this morning:

INTERCOM BUYERS EXPECTED PRIZES, BUT GOT MORTGAGES

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

"The salesman made it seem so nice," one housewife remembered. "It looked as though we could cut the total price way down—maybe even make a profit."

She did not make a profit. Instead, she is paying more than she expected for a very special kind of status symbol—a home intercom system. And she had a second mortgage on her home that she never knew she signed.

She is one of scores of customers of six local firms who sold intercoms and water softeners during the past five years and whose sales practices are now under investigation by Federal authorities.

There are many reputable electrical firms in Washington that sell such equipment without questionable sales methods and without obtaining second mortgages to secure payment of the sales price.

The salesmen of the six firms under investigation went door-to-door in ghetto and other inner-city neighborhoods where the intercoms and water softeners are surprisingly big sellers.

The six firms used "chain referral" sales schemes in which salesmen offered homeowners a chance to get large amounts of their money back by referring new customers to the firm.

Their customers have complained, in court suits and interviews with reporters of The Washington Post, that they did not get much or any money back and that they wound up with second mortgages on their homes—mortgages they didn't know they had signed.

The six firms are among a dozen under investigation by local and Federal authorities for their second-mortgage practices.

Reporters went through real estate records and called homeowner after homeowner listed as having \$1389 second mortgages on their homes. Time after time, it turned out that the homeowner was a customer of one of the firms, Allied Enterprises, Inc.

Many said they had not known that the mortgages existed. Those who did know about them said they had not found out until they were contacted by police or Federal investigators, or called the finance company that was collecting their payments.

The homeowners all told the same story:

An Allied salesman came to their home to tell them about the intercom system—complete with am-fm radio, and burglar and fire "panic" alarms.

The \$1389 price seemed high to the homeowner. (One electrical contractor told reporters that a maximum for this type of job would be \$600, without financing charges.)

PROMISED PRIZES

But the Allied salesman told them they could get money back in "prizes" for referring friends to Allied as customers, according to the homeowners.

The homeowner was told he would become an "equipment-owning representative" and receive \$100 for each person referred who bought an intercom. And he could receive up to \$1000 in additional prizes for making 45 "qualified demonstrations" of his intercom system to prospective customers.

But a Federal Trade Commission examiner

found earlier this year that "few, if any" of Allied's customers received "enough referral commissions to obtain their intercom at little or no cost."

Allied's salesmen made "false, misleading and deceptive" statements to customers that the intercom was "being sold at a reduced price as an introductory or advertising plan," the FTC examiner ruled.

And, he added, Allied's salesmen, "for the purpose of inducing the sale" of its product, failed to inform customers that they were signing a second mortgage on their home.

The FTC examiner ordered Allied, and its president, William R. Marion Sr., to "cease and desist" from using chain-referral selling schemes or any "false, misleading or deceptive" statements in trying to get names of more prospective customers.

WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

At about this time, when the FTC order was issued last January, Allied went out of business. It left behind more than 200 homeowners with nearly \$300,000 worth of second mortgages, according to District real estate records.

Five homeowners have brought suit against Allied in U.S. District Court charging that the firm defrauded them through misleading chain referral sales schemes, and obtained their signatures on second mortgages without their knowledge.

Marion, who lives at 211 Dorset rd., Laurel, Md., could not be reached for comment yesterday. Mrs. Marion told a reporter that her husband had been in the home-improvement field for 15 years "and this (the FTC order) is the only time he has been in any trouble."

One homeowner who has filed suit against Allied, Lugenure Talbert, of 1224 Farraday pl., ne., said in her suit that an Allied salesman, Samuel C. Cratch Jr., persuaded her to buy an intercom after he explained the sales referral plan.

After the intercom was installed, she said, Cratch returned with more papers to sign. "You signed the contract improperly," Mrs. Talbert quoted Cratch in her court complaint. She signed again.

She said she did not realize that she must have signed a mortgage at that time until she got a letter from the Atlas Credit Corp. in Philadelphia informing her that it had bought her note, secured by a second mortgage. Her note was for \$1389, the price of the intercom plus financing charges.

Cratch, in his answer to Mrs. Talbert's complaint, denied any wrongdoing. Atlas answered that it bought the note without knowledge of any fraud. Allied has not yet answered the suit.

Mrs. Talbert also charged that no notary public was present when she signed the papers in her home. The other four homeowners who sued Allied also said that they never appeared before a notary public during their dealings with Allied.

Yet in all five cases, the name and seal of the same notary public in Prince George's County, Md., appears on second mortgage in favor of Allied filed in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office.

Several Allied customers interviewed by reporters said they would not have bought the intercoms if they had realized they were signing second mortgages to secure the notes for them. They also said they would have rejected the deal if they had known they wouldn't get any referral "prizes."

FEW GOT PRIZES

Only a few of the Allied customers interviewed said, they got any money back from Allied at all. No one interviewed said they received more than \$100.

Allied broke down its \$1389 price for the intercom into \$992 for the equipment and installation and \$397 financing charges. The system included the intercom master panel with an am-fm radio, six speakers and fire and burglar alarm devices.

The same brand of intercom system was sold by yet another firm operating here until late last year. This firm was called United Home Enterprises Corp., which also sold water softeners. United did at least \$120,000 worth of business here in two years, real estate records show.

In February, two of its officers, Robert M. Cederlof and Adrian J. Barba, were indicted by a U.S. grand jury, which charged them with forging the names of eight Washington homeowners on eight mortgages in favor of United Home Enterprises. Their case is still pending and they are free in custody of their counsel.

Three of the homeowners named as complaining witnesses in the criminal case have filed suit against United Home Enterprises, claiming that their signatures were obtained on second mortgages by "fraud, trick and device" or by forgery.

They charge that they were talked into buying intercoms or water softeners at prices "in excess of the fair value of the equipment," again through the device of being offered money "prizes" for customer referrals.

In all three cases, the homeowners also charged that they never appeared before a notary public while signing papers for the United salesman.

In two cases, the seal and signature of a Prince George's County notary appears on the mortgage filed with the D.C. Recorder of Deeds. In the third case, the notarization is by a D.C. notary public.

NOTARIZATION DISPUTED

Other United Home Enterprises customers whose mortgage signatures were notarized by these two notaries told reporters that they never appeared before a notary public.

Cederlof said he told all the homeowners that they were signing "a second trust," although he added that he did not explain what it meant. "If you are a property owner, you should know what that means," Cederlof said.

When asked about the use of a chain referral sales method that homeowners have claimed is fraudulent, Cederlof said that "my firm is not being accused of this in the indictments."

Cederlof said the firm stopped doing business last year. "I don't feel that I misrepresented anything to the people," he says.

Besides Allied and United, at least four other firms have sold intercoms or water softeners to Washington homeowners using the chain referral sales method and obtaining signatures unknowingly in second mortgages, according to homeowners' court complaints.

According to court suits, interviews with homeowners, and information in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office, the majority of the notes and mortgages generated by Allied Enterprises and United Home Enterprises was bought by the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (since merged into Sunasco, Inc.), through a Washington mortgage broker.

Atlas is named as a defendant in seven of the eight court suits by homeowners against the two intercom firms. In each case, Atlas answered by saying that it bought the notes as a third party "without knowledge of any fraud" in the obtaining of the notes.

The law generally presumes that the third party—the "holder in due course"—has bought the note in good faith and has the right to collect on the note it paid for.

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING: MAN OF PEACE OR APOSTLE OF VIOLENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible cases of American naivety can be found in the strange story of Rev. Martin Luther King. While alert Americans generally seem intent on discovering the facts, discussing the issues, and developing a dialog in scores of social, economic, political, and religious areas and debating the pros and cons of the Bishop Pikes, the Rap Browns, and the George Lincoln Rockwells, there is a strange silence and lack of debate when it comes to Martin Luther King.

It is almost as if he is being consciously protected by the press which normally accepts accolades for presenting both sides of a story and piercing with rays of informative reportorial light all proper facets of national life. King is a national figure, this cannot be denied. He is one of the only men who can go from jail cell to a conference with the President of the United States. His name is known; his cause is said to be civil rights. For one reason or another, however, very little is known about the real Martin Luther King. I believe that if his true character were known, he would not be able to command a corporal's guard to follow him.

While preaching nonviolence, I believe the record clearly shows him to be an apostle of violence. While gaining major support from clergymen, I believe he has preached an expedient, totally materialistic line which is the antithesis of religious teachings. He has openly associated with the most radical elements in our society. I believe he has done more for the Communist Party than any other person of this decade.

These may sound like strong words, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are even harsher. I have heard Reverend King speak. On one occasion he may have a soulful melancholy that is, without doubt, most impressive. On another, he can rant with the best of the demagogues; and while more sophisticated than Stokely Carmichael or Rap Brown, he says, in effect, the same thing. He makes no pretense at keeping his skirts clean or his house in order. He does not have to because the past 10 years have demonstrated that the liberal community and the news media of our country will either not note or meekly forgive his indiscretions.

Take the year 1967 alone. At a time when Detroit and Newark had just witnessed a virtual guerrilla war and a chaotic lawlessness without equal in modern times, King was urging a massive dislocation of northern cities. Instead of intervening as a moderating influence he took up the cause of the rabble-rousers and threatened these dislocations which, he averred, would force the Congress to provide financial assistance for slum Negroes. Yes, he would force us. Force us in this free society. Force is a word he understands well. He added:

This is something like a last plea to the nation to respond to nonviolence. There is a great deal of bitterness (in the slums). If

there is not provided a channel of constructive action, this bitterness will lead to desperation riots and social disruption.

At a time when the incendiary statements of Brown and Carmichael were sparking the riot-prone tensions, did King emerge as a national leader seeking to soothe these passions? No, he attended as keynote speaker the most radical assemblage of anti-Americans ever put together, and as the Communist Daily Worker approvingly and glowingly reported:

He described vividly the racism that can praise in its history books a white Patrick Henry who sounded the call against the British redcoats while it condemns H. Rap Brown who insists that black victims of oppression in America should fight for their freedom.

Imagine that—comparing the rabble-rousers, the looters, the social misfits in America to patriots like Patrick Henry. He was further quoted as saying "Maybe the bluecoats in the ghetto are our redcoats."

The convention, the National Conference for New Politics—NCNP—heard chantings of "Kill Whitey, Kill Whitey" and the most revolutionary anti-American doctrine that could be imagined and yet the August 29–September 4, 1967, confab had the supposed "man of peace" Mr. King as their keynoter. It represented a major breakthrough for the Communist Party and King helped. For years, the Communists have chafed at the doctrine of separation which tended to keep them out of respectable liberal gatherings. In the 1930's, the liberals worked hand in hand with the Reds but the growth of anticommunism in the Nation has brought about a change in the 1950's and 1960's. Except for the more radical groups, liberals in general have tried to keep Communists from participating in their causes and at their conventions. King has consistently worked with Communists and has helped give them a respectability they do not deserve. The NCNP in Chicago represented such a breakthrough in the Red's goal of "non-exclusion" that they editorialized gleefully in their organ, the Daily Worker, on August 22, 1967.

Reverend King is the hero of many militant Negro leaders although denounced by others in the black power structure. He has allied with Cassius Clay. When you study his speeches closely you are struck by the obvious fact that while ostensibly condemning racism, he himself preaches a black racism. One of the leading black racists in the country is Rev. Albert C. Cleage, Jr., who just after the terrible riot told his Central United Church of Christ in Detroit:

There is no escape for you and when white people try to tell that good niggers can get through this golden door of integration, don't believe it. We don't even want that door because that's destroying us.

Cleage went on to say:

We are dealing with an enemy who is not going to accept us into American life.

In extolling King, he noted:

Dr. King led black people to understand that integration could never come to pass. He helped black men understand that "the man" is an enemy.

In his flagrant disregard for law and order, Reverend King has given credibility to one of the most dangerous dogmas that can be promoted in an orderly society. He simply arrogates to his own inspiration the whim to disobey any law which he loosely terms unjust. Court orders, State, and Federal laws, municipal ordinances—they must all fall in front of his supposition that he has a divine right to break the law. His conduct is clearly criminal in this regard and certainly has helped develop the idea among rioters and looters that they can obey their own concepts of good and bad laws and act accordingly.

Like most power-hungry tyrants, he has gone one step too far. In disobeying a court order, he was sentenced to jail. On appeal to the Supreme Court, he was surprised to find that a usually supine and hopelessly liberal Court rose up in indignation and slapped his wrists in a strong indictment of his illegal activity. Said the Court in affirming his jail sentence on June 12, 1967:

This Court cannot hold that the petitioners were constitutionally free to ignore all the procedures of the law and carry their battle to the streets. One may sympathize with the petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this succinct statement should be burned into the consciousness of all of those who have at one time or another fallen for the pious pronouncements of Martin Luther King. Carrying the battles to the streets, as the Court phrases it, is not a constitutional right. It is, in reality, criminal conduct and should not be condoned by any thinking American. I repeat again the Court's most emphatic statement:

But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

At the height of the rioting fury which was sweeping the country, King joined three other civil rights leaders in issuing a cautious call for an end to violence because, among other things, it is self-destructive to the Negroes' interest. This was on July 26, 1967. Two days later King was visiting Cleveland, Ohio, on an inspection tour. He tersely expanded on his theme of violence being self-destructive when he said:

I can't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned.

No statement, Mr. Speaker, could more clearly expose the irresponsible, cynical nature of the subject of these remarks. This is typical of the manner in which he advocates "nonviolence." Burning, looting, and killing are not immoral or wrong, it would seem. Merely destructive to the self-interest of this particular minority group.

Reverend King expresses indignation over Vietnam. In this he is joined by many millions of Americans. Few of us are pleased at what is happening there but we are not disloyal to our Nation. Reverend King showed his true colors in April of this year in a major speech

he delivered on Vietnam. I believe that any thinking American who will study his words must conclude as I have that he is disloyal to the United States. He maligned his country with lies and accusations that come straight from the Communist Party line. A strong statement you say. Listen to what he said. He praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as the "greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," and likened our Nation to Hitler's Germany. He condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators" and threw out wild charges like the United States may have killed 1 million children in Vietnam. He conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so he could denounce it. He said we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony. These are but a few of the wild accusations of the Nobel Prize winner many people have been led to believe is a man of peace.

Even the ultra-liberal Washington Post could not stomach King's blatant lies and propaganda. In an editorial entitled "A Tragedy," they roundly condemned King by saying, in part:

A TRAGEDY

Dr. Martin Luther King's Vietnam speech was not a sober and responsible comment on the war but a reflection of his disappointment at the slow progress of civil rights and the war on poverty.

It was filled with bitter and damaging allegations and inferences that he did not and could not document. He flatly charged the Government with sending Negroes to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. But Negro troops constitute 11 per cent of the enlisted personnel in Vietnam (10.5 per cent of the population was Negro in 1960). Negro casualties are higher than this (22.5 per cent of killed in action) because of higher Negro enlistment for elite corps and higher rate of Negro re-enlistment. No doubt these figures reflect in part the fact that civilian employment opportunities are not as great for the Negro. But they also reflect, in part, the zeal and courage of Negro soldiers. And they reflect the fact that in this war the Negro in uniform is not limited to work battalions.

Dr. King says the United States may have caused a million civilian casualties in Vietnam—mostly children—but he did not give any supporting authority for this statement.

He stated flatly that "our officials know" that less than 25 per cent of the members of the National Liberation Front are Communist—but he neglected to say what officials or where they said it.

He contends that Ho Chi Minh knows that the bombing and shelling we are doing is "part of traditional preinvasion strategy," but gives no credence to our express declaration that no invasion is intended.

He has no doubts that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and thinks it will become clear that our "minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony." He feels that men will "not refrain from thinking" that our "maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations." It is one thing to reproach a government for what it has done and said; it is quite another to attribute to it policies it has never avowed and purposes it has never entertained and then to rebuke it for these sheer inventions of unsupported fantasy.

He has even conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so that he could denounce it.

Dr. King is right to reproach America for not ending discrimination and poverty. But these are failure for which every Administration in the history of the United States deserves more reproach than this one. It is strange irony indeed that the Government which has labored the hardest to right these ancient wrongs is the object of the most savage denunciation, the most unreserved criticism and the most unfair blame.

Dr. King has done a grave injury to those who are his natural allies in a great struggle to remove ancient abuses from our public life; and he has done an even graver injury to himself. Many who have listened to him with respect will never again accord him the same confidence. He has diminished his usefulness to his cause, to his country and to his people. And that is a great tragedy.

To those liberal and bleeding hearts who have not intelligently discerned what King has been saying and doing, during his decade of prominence, this may have come as a tragedy. To those of us who have followed him closely and have been aware, by both public and confidential documentation, of his questionable activity, it comes as no surprise at all. In 1967 the real King surfaced and yet where is the criticism he should be getting?

These are but a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, in the disappointing story of Martin Luther King. I say disappointing because he has had a rare opportunity to align himself with an important cause and work for solution to social ills through our democratic process. This he has not done. He has had the opportunity to work with men of good will but all too often he has aligned himself with the most radical and un-American elements in our country. I now present in detail some of the background of Martin Luther King.

THE VIOLENT NONVIOLENCE OF DR. KING

"I have a deep commitment to non-violence"—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On May 4, 1963, police dogs and firehoses were used to quell a demonstration by lawbreakers in Birmingham, Ala. There had been violence plain and simple. Martin Luther King and his right-hand man, Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, threatened that these demonstrations would continue until there were not only promises of an end to segregation but "action." There was, they said, "no intention of relaxing pressure without such action. We negotiate from strength" and "will consider" calling off the demonstrations after the action. This was the mood of the well-known nonviolence of Dr. King.

The day following action by police dogs and firehoses, the New York Times reported that residents of Birmingham heard from the lips of King, the man who preached peace in the streets but led the lawless bands:

Today was D-Day. Tomorrow will be double D-Day.

One seldom hears Martin Luther King's name without the "nonviolent" slogans coming in successive breaths. But quite often the nonviolence of King leads to violence of riot proportions. The big lie technique is clearly used. Repeat "nonviolence" over and over so the public will believe it and then practice violence or the encouraging of violence.

Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. It is not an exaggeration to say he leaves a trail of violence in his wake.

In addition to the physical presence of Martin Luther King in flammable cities, there is the presence of King's words and ideas in every tension area across the United States. The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1958, King was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

It is regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident.

On many occasions, like Chicago in 1966, he goes to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, he adds to the riot-producing tension.

Early statements of King reveal continued use of the phrase "direct action programs." His philosophy and purpose as outlined in his book, "Why We Can't Wait," amount to this. Note his forked tongue semantics. He admits that there is an effort to create a "crisis packed situation" but he concludes he is not a "creator of tension." He stated:

The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with.

In August of this year, at a time of serious racial tension, he said virtually the same thing—again with a certain amount of double talk. King said:

Negroes will be mentally healthier if they do not suppress rage but vent it constructively and its energy peacefully but forcefully to cripple the operations of an oppressive society.

Read that one over several times and try to tie together the words "rage" which somehow is to be "vented" to "cripple" an "oppressive society."

Louis Waldman, a leading Negro labor lawyer in Chicago, answered King's statement this way:

The philosophy and purpose of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce "crisis-packed" situations and "tension." Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence. And the provocation of violence is violence. To describe such provocation as "nonviolent" is to trifle with the plain meaning of words.

The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement throughout the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it. . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany, both on his road to power and after power came to him. . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions.

Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, of provoking "tensions" as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties

and to constitutional government. Such a policy flies in the teeth of the very purpose of our Constitution, which is clearly stated in the Preamble to be, among other things, "to insure domestic tranquillity."

This is a damning indictment from a man who praises nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights, and it comes not from a racist, but from a Negro who has been a champion of civil rights for decades.

Most Americans call the bloodshed, looting, fire bombing, and vandalism by its true name, violence, and to argue that these results of the King-led, -organized, and -backed marches, demonstrations, sit-ins, lie-ins, and the like are the fault of those who react against them is to argue not only against logic but also the law. The Supreme Court, in *Hague* against CIO, 1939, said:

The privilege of a citizen to use the streets and parks for the communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interests of all . . . and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order."

This opinion of the Court was reaffirmed as late as 1966. Former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker makes the point that it is an "ancient and honored legal maxim that all men are presumed to intend the natural consequences of their acts." From this maxim comes severe condemnation of Dr. King for the broad areas of unrest and lawlessness which he promotes under the title of civil rights. Largely through the connivance of the liberal community, King has generally escaped the responsibility he deserves for the logical consequences of his civil disobedience pronouncements.

THE UNJUST LAWS

King explained his ideas on civil disobedience in terms of just and unjust laws, and how they are to be broken, during an interview on the March 28, 1965, "Meet the Press":

I do feel that there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws.

I think that the distinction here is that when one breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, he must do it openly, he must do it cheerfully, he must do it lovingly, he must do it civilly, not uncivilly, and he must do it with a willingness to accept the penalty.

To King the only guide whether or not to violate the law is his own particular whim or caprice. He and he alone will decide. Note that there is no mention of the fact that following one's conscience may violate the conscious obedience to the law by many other citizens. To King it makes no difference, if one accepts the penalty.

In the recent Birmingham decision, already cited, which upheld fines and jail terms for King and others who defied a court injunction against a civil rights march, the majority of the Supreme Court agreed that:

Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses . . . Respect

for the judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, *which alone can give meaning to constitutional freedom.* (Emphasis added.)

As usual, Reverend King tried to equate his own illegal contempt of court to Negro injustice. Appearing on the nationwide June 18, 1967, ABC program "Issues and Answers" he found the prospect of his 5-day jail sentence and the U.S. Supreme Court decision which ordered it upsetting to all Negroes. He warned the decision would "encourage riots and violence in the sense that it all but said that Negroes cannot redress their grievances through peaceful means without facing the kind of decision that we face."

This is directly false. In addition to his usual "invitation" to riots and violence, he tries to evade the real issue. He was not engaging in "peaceful means." He was engaging in illegal means, flouting the judicial process. The court decision was not saying anything to Negroes, it was a statement the law of the land which was clearly applicable to every American. The true King can be seen in this twisting of the facts, his effort at personal martyrdom and the veiled threat of riots and violence which he uses in virtually every situation.

The value of committing acts of civil disobedience "openly," "lovingly," as it were, is commented on by Attorney Waldman, previously cited:

Apparently, Dr. King thinks that in violating laws "openly" he and his followers are more virtuous than those who violate laws secretly. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. The open violation of law is an open invitation to others to join in such violation. Disobedience to law is bad enough when done secretly, but it is far worse when done openly, especially when accompanied by clothing such acts in the mantle of virtue and organizing well advertised and financed plans to carry out such violations. The secret violator of law recognizes his act for what it is: an antisocial act; he may even be ashamed of what he is doing and seek to avoid disapprobation of his neighbors. But the open violator, the agitating violator, acts shamelessly, in defiance of his neighbor's judgment and his fellow man's disapproval.

Dr. King defines unjust laws as "those in which people are required to obey a code that they had no part in making because they were denied the right to vote."

When pinned down about communities where Negroes have the right to vote, and asked whether there was still the "right" to disobey, King expanded his code for lawlessness even more:

There may be a community where Negroes have the right to vote, but there are still unjust laws in that community. There may be unjust laws in a community where people in large numbers are voting, and I think wherever unjust laws exist people have a right to disobey these laws.

Here King jumped from Negroes to all people and from people without voting privileges to even those who do have the constitutional methods of change open to them. To him, the majority might always be wrong, the minority always right. Acceptance and promotion of this philosophy can only lead to the disintegration of American society. From it follows the

chaotic situation where any one who believes, or even feels, that a law is unjust merely disobeys. The denial of freedom to the majority of Americans who obey the law is proportional to the number of persons who set themselves up as final judge and then disobey. While professing Christianity and humility, King strikes a harder blow at fundamental concepts of justice than any would-be dictator or other demagog in contemporary American history.

On the same "Meet the Press" program referred to earlier, Tom Wicker of the New York Times asked:

How are we to enforce law when a doctrine is preached that one man's conscience may tell him that the law is unjust, when other men's consciences don't tell him that?

King responded:

I think you enforce it, and I think you deal with it by not allowing anarchy to develop. I think the chief norm for guiding the situation is the willingness to accept the penalty, and I don't think any society can call an individual irresponsible who breaks a law and willingly accepts the penalty.

This is more King jibberish and feigned piety. To commit murder, for example, and then willingly go to prison to pay the penalty cannot change the nature of the transgression—it is still wrong.

Willingly or not, the question is still, in Judge Whittaker's words:

Can anyone reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded history none ever has. . . . History also shows that, in each instance, the first evidence of the society's decay appeared in its toleration of disrespect for, and violation of, its law. There is no good reason to believe that similar toleration will serve us differently.

WHEN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE BECOMES NECESSARY

Inflammatory statements, threats and actual instances of civil disobedience are evident throughout the career of Martin Luther King. In December 1959, King called on southern Negroes to practice civil disobedience, if necessary, and to break, openly, any State or local law "not in harmony with Federal law. This," he continued, "is the creative moment for a full scale assault on the system of segregation. We must practice open, civil disobedience."

In the fall of 1961 King spoke on the role of the Negro student, stated his hollow call for nonviolence and in the next breath called for "disobeying the unjust laws."

Two years later in Birmingham, King warned that city of more massive demonstrations:

I hope civil disobedience will not be necessary but, if something is not done quickly, if Congress filibusters the civil rights bill and does not pass the public accommodation section, Negroes will have to engage in massive civil disobedience.

Ten days later he said he feared violence and warned again that if the civil rights bill did not pass it "may lead to a night of darkness and violence."

I personally heard his threats at Howard University in 1964 during the time when Congress was debating the civil rights program, and I can assure you that he spoke not as a man of peace but as a man of violence.

In February of 1966, King and his men decided to assume "trusteeships" of a six-flat tenement in Chicago as part of a campaign to improve living conditions for the residents. King had no authority; his power was only that which is derived from police-state tactics. He simply took over. His reasoning: "morality" is more important than the law and property rights, the action was "supralegal," above the law.

In early April 1966, a circuit court judge enjoined King and his associates from entering the building, interfering, or collecting rent from the tenants, all of which they had done. There can be no denial of King's influence and the results of his "nonviolent" demonstrations and "direct action" programs.

The New York Times of July 16, 1962, stated that Reverend King "threatened a new drive for Negro rights" in Albany, Ga. Ten days later, leader King, according to the Times, set a day of penance following a night of rioting during which Negroes were arrested as they marched on city hall, hooting, laughing, and throwing bottles, bricks, and rocks at law officials. August 11, the police chief of Albany testified that the situation had been under control until King returned to the city to be tried for an illegal demonstration.

Another example of the "nonviolent direct-action" programs of Dr. King was exposed in July 1966 in the syndicated column by respected columnists, Robert Allen and Paul Scott. Their exposé reported that King and company were contacting, and enlisting, Chicago street gangs and "bringing them into the civil rights movement to fight 'the power structure'."

From a report said to be circulating through the U.S. Department of Justice, the columnists quoted these statements: King's lieutenants telling gang leaders that "the real foes are Mayor Daley, policemen, slumlords, bankers, businessmen, and school administrators"; or haranguing that this is an "unjust society"; and that "the gang members are being incited to violence instead of being taught nonviolence"; that "gang leaders have little or no understanding of civil rights, but do know how to use force." King, they said, had personally met several times with gang leaders who have a combined following of 1,000.

During the same month that King was reported to be enlisting the gangs, Chicago police battled some 300 Negroes for 2 straight hours of rioting. During the looting, gunfire, rock throwing, Molotov cocktail barrage, King reportedly sped from one trouble spot to another, ostensibly to quiet things, but reporters noted that he seldom got out of the car.

Some time later, August 9, the Chicago Tribune reported that:

The Chicago Lawn area was the scene Friday night of civil rights disorder as the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led Chicago marchers into the community to promote open housing for Negroes.

The Chicago riots of July 1966 deserve elaboration. Here is a selected sequence of events: The July 12 riot broke out just 2 days after King's mass civil rights rally.

The Baltimore Sun, July 10, 1966, reported:

In an interview . . . Dr. King acknowledged that his "end slums campaign in Chicago is an implementation program for the concept of 'black power,'" but under a more palatable name.

Dr. King acknowledged that his presence in Chicago, the street rallies, sit-ins, marches, and door-to-door campaign to sign up members of protesting [units] have more far-reaching aims than the immediate dramatization of problems of impoverished Negroes.

The next day King and Mayor Daley held a "showdown" meeting in the mayor's office. On July 14 the New York Times reported that the near West Side was tense after a police car was stoned by more than 100 Negro youths. Martin Luther King attributed the disturbance to the Mayor's refusal to make concessions to his civil rights program. This is his typical style. Rarely has Reverend King chastized looters, arsonists, and conspirators for violence. He always justifies their actions and, directly or indirectly, encourages them.

The report continued:

Dr. King . . . spoke at the headquarters of the West Side Organization, where a sign on the wall said: "Burn, baby, burn, boycott, baby, boycott." Roving bands of youths and some adults . . . broke windows, looted stores, and stoned police cars and small police vans.

During the weekend of the 16th, 17th, and 18th, Governor Kerner called out the National Guard when police could not control rioting that in 3 nights included burning, looting, two deaths, 100 injuries, 300 arrests, and extensive property damage.

A few days before the riot, King stated that disrupting the flow of Chicago's traffic—a tactic of Dr. King's—would be "rough" on city officials "when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway) but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Another "nonviolent" pilot project was thus in action.

It is doubtful that the city officials made the final choice.

Chicago's Mayor Daley, as reported in the New York Times, "asserted angrily that the strife was 'planned!' Dr. King's aides were in here for no other reason than to bring disorder to the streets of Chicago," he concluded.

Following contact with the gangs mentioned earlier, it is disturbing to note that press accounts of the riots stated that Negro street gangs fanned the flames in the riot and were given credit for spreading violence to greater limits.

The Chicago Tribune reported that prior to the riots, King had showed films detailing the violence of Watts. Asked by the Tribune about this, King replied:

The films showing the Watts riots were to demonstrate the negative effect of riots.

The films add another dimension to the activities of King that are well known by law enforcement officials. Their general reaction to King is summed up by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in this statement:

Unfortunately, some civil rights leaders in the past have condoned what they describe as civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations.

Martin Luther King, Jr., for example, after arriving in Chicago, Ill., early in 1966 in connection with the civil rights drive there, commented about the use of so-called civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations and said:

"It may be necessary to engage in such acts. . . . Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law."

Such a course of action is fraught with danger for if everyone took it upon himself to break any law that he believed was morally unjust, it is readily apparent there would soon be complete chaos in this country.

When the riots broke out on July 12, did Martin Luther King enter the scene as a moderating influence? Absolutely not. On the second day of the riot, July 13, a rally was held at a local church and King appeared with one Chester Robinson, executive director of the West Side Organization, who made highly inflammatory accusations about the Chicago police. King's respectability added to the occasion. Robinson, incidentally, is an ex-convict with an extensive arrest record dating back to 1949. Such are the men King finds himself with time and time again.

The first amendment guarantees the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, but it does not allow any latitude for disobedience. It is absurd to even imagine a situation where a law protects the right to disobey a law. To say this is to say that law is not law.

Throughout, the actions of Dr. King have been termed "civil" disobediences, but Justice Whittaker makes this point:

What we are confronted by, and must deal with, are active, overt, willful mass violations of our *criminal* laws. That conduct is not "civil disobedience" in any dictionary or acceptable sense of those words. The understandable desire to avoid openly admitting advocacy and commission of *crime* cannot excuse us from calling that conduct what it is. Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our *criminal* laws are criminal violations and not "*civil disobedience*."

The final result of disobedience is not only gross violations of law during riots and marches, but in the opinion of Justice Whittaker, encompasses a general furthering of lawlessness throughout the country. "Toleration and appeasements" of the "many misguided preachments and activities of Dr. King are heavily contributing causes of the general disrespect for law and hence of the crime that is now rampant throughout our Nation."

I believe it is fair to conclude that Martin Luther King has been an apostle of violence and lawlessness, not peace and nonviolence. His method has been criminal conduct and conspiracy, not civil disobedience. To call it anything else would be the same perversion of the truth that King has engaged in for years.

A MINISTER BUT OF WHAT?

Although Dr. King asks the world to believe that he is a man of God and appeals to "higher laws" in justifying his acts of law breaking, it is incredible that he should expect the people of the United States to be so gullible as to accept the

Biblical and historical precedents he conjures up as valid. They are not.

To use Biblical passages as a pretext for his call to lawlessness, King must first deny the context in which the Apostles lived and preached. They had no system of appeals. There was no guarantee of freedom. There was no free speech. The parallel is invalid.

In the opinion of the dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles L. Feinberg:

Those who point to Biblical examples of resistance to authority forget the spiritual principles involved there, and are unmindful that they in that day had no such legal provisions for redress for their grievances such as we have today.

That Dr. King should disregard the total context of the New Testament, and the Book of Acts in particular, can hardly be believed.

It is also incredible that King would attempt to compare the civil disobedience of today with the Boston Tea Party. To make this comparison is, again, to forget that there were no channels of appeal or meaningful democratic remedy available to those American patriots. It is interesting to note that the Boston Tea Party and other acts against authority by the colonists were the beginnings of the overthrowing of a foreign government. We must assume that Dr. King knows this basic historic fact. His views and tactics on this point are hardly American.

Dr. King uses these methods to push into areas and communities where the residents, from mayor to fellow clergyman, say he is not wanted or needed. Some of the greatest condemnation of Martin Luther King has come from men of the church.

In 1964, delegates to the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution, "noting with regret that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, had been represented before the world as a peace-loving Christian minister crusading in the interest of Negro life."

In 1966, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, said that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

In 1965, a Negro alderman in Chicago, Ralph H. Metcalf, criticized King and his group, said King had "ulterior motives" in moving into Chicago with his programs and leveled the blast at King that:

This is no hick town. The leaders can handle the situation. We have adequate leadership here.

Metcalf said that King would not be "objective."

The Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967 reported:

The Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, long critical of the civil rights tactics of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., has formally split with Dr. King's group. . . .

The article added that King's group and the NAACP have been at odds over

King's tactics last year in the open housing march.

Episcopal minister, Dr. Robert B. Watts, of La Jolla, Calif., is another clergyman who has scored King's disobedience stand and his apparent belief that the end justifies the means. Dr. Watts declared that no one, "however exalted he may be or regard himself, has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught." The doctrine of morally justified civil disobedience should be rejected, he added.

Dr. King's disregard for the law is deplorable, but his disregard for the laws of God is almost inconceivable. Rather than merely serving to justify the ends of Martin Luther King, the laws of God are in great part incorporated for the benefit of all into the laws of our Nation. To flout one is to flout the other. As Justice Whittaker sums it up:

It is highly important carefully to note and explain that our Constitution and laws embody many of the concepts of the divine laws, including the Ten Commandments. . . .

Many who have hurled assaults against our laws do not know what they are. . . . do not know or realize that many of the laws they so condemn, and often flout, actually are embodiments of the laws of God, such as, Thou shalt not kill; Thou shalt love, not injure, thy neighbor; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's property or possessions; and Thou shalt not bear false witness; to mention but a few of the divine laws that are embodied into our criminal laws. To say that our laws, which condemn the violation of those concepts, are "unjust" or "unfair" is, of course, to say also that the divine laws are "unjust" or "unfair." Do those who advocate violation of, and violate, these of our laws understand this? I doubt that they do, and giving them the benefit of the doubt, I prefer to believe that they do not. Nor should we overlook, as is so often done, the Biblical admonition that Thou shalt obey the civil authorities. I wonder how those who advocate violation of, and violate, our laws—civil or criminal—can square their conduct with the Biblical admonition.

Perhaps one of the strongest statements from a fellow clergyman came in April of this year. The blunt, descriptive attack on King came from the Rev. Henry Mitchell, leader of a group of West Side Chicago ministers. Here is the account as reported by the Chicago Tribune:

The leader of a group of west side Negro ministers declared yesterday that Dr. Martin Luther King should "get the hell out of here" because his civil rights marching in Chicago last summer (1966) "created hate."

"If he wants to march on the west side, let him march with rakes, brooms, and grass seed," said Rev. Henry Mitchell. . . .

He said the ministers represented the sentiments of 50,000 Chicago Negroes who want "peace, love, and harmony," don't approve of civil rights marches, and "just want to live in their communities and upgrade them."

Justin E. Walsh wrote in the monthly magazine, Rally, about those who use the pulpit for their strange social and political pronouncements. It seems to fit Martin Luther King, Walsh said:

Thus the pulpit becomes a political rostrum from whence God Himself directs the defeat of Barry Goldwater, the march on Selma, or a teach-in protesting American

involvement in Viet Nam. The sacred and profane become confused, religion is reduced to an adjunct of political agitation, and church attendance falls because Americans do not indorse such schemes, will not listen to preachers who do.

Possibly the answer can be found in I Corinthians 1:27. It quite prophetically says:

But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.

In his constant preaching that the ends justify the means, King is not speaking in the Judeo-Christian heritage belief. This is crass materialism and Marxism. It is expediency not principle. It is frightening to contemplate the many leading clergymen that consciously join his cause or acquiesce by their silence. Even worse, he is being currently depicted as a modern Christian hero by a Catholic catechism series. The total picture of Martin Luther King brings one fundamental question to mind: He says he is a minister. A minister of what?

SOME KING ASSOCIATIONS AND CAUSES

Over 20 years ago the Brookings Institution, a respected social science institution, in response to a request from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, outlined five areas which comprised the definition of "Un-American Activities." One classification was the denial of constitutional rights or privileges by force, fraud, bribery, etc. Another definition encompassed activities which seek to advance the interests of a foreign power which are clearly against the interests of the United States. The Communist Party, U.S.A., has been found repeatedly by voluminous evidence to belong to this category. Neither of these organizations are truly friends of the American Negro. Yet, while one would be shocked to find Martin Luther King consistently cooperating with the KKK, his history regarding pro-Communist persons, causes, and organizations is a matter of record.

Despite the fact that a number of Negro ex-Communists, some of whom had worked for the FBI, have warned American Negroes in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that the Communist Party seeks to exploit them, King, in contrast, sponsors a Communist front, the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. While these patriotic Negroes cooperated with HCUA, King rarely misses an opportunity to discredit HCUA.

Would King have associated himself in any way with the Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, the National Lawyers Guild, or the Spring Mobilization Committee if they were KKK fronts instead of Communist?

Could Martin Luther King have sent a congratulatory message to a union convention if that union, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, had been expelled from the CIO for domination by the KKK instead of being Communist-dominated?

Must white hoods adorn the heads of the Bradens or Frank Wilkinson—

identified Communist Party members, or James Dombrowski and Myles Horton—long-time advocates of Communist causes, before King realizes that they are bad news for the civil rights movement? Or that their organizations, the Highlander Center, formerly the Highlander Folk School, and the Southern Conference Educational Fund place a pro-Communist stigma on any undertaking associated with them?

If some of King's associates showed an affinity for KKK causes instead of those of a pro-Communist nature, would they remain in his organization for long?

With regard to communism Martin Luther King has written in "Stride Toward Freedom" that "almost anything—force, violence, murder, lying—is a justifiable means to the 'millennial' end." It is evident that King is aware of the treacherous nature of the International Communist Movement and its American branch, the Communist Party, U.S.A. Moreover, there is ample evidence to prove that the CPUSA and some of its various fronts seek to exploit the legitimate civil rights aims and aspirations of the Negro people in the United States.

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI first began studying the activities of the Communist movement in 1919 and is today the most knowledgeable source of Communist machinations in the United States. In February 1966, before a House subcommittee, Mr. Hoover stated:

Historically, the Communist Party U.S.A. has never overlooked the potential inherent in any of our country's problems, be they domestic or foreign. Every crisis is grasped in an effort to exploit the situation for the advancement of Communist objectives. Similarly, the party has always aimed its biggest "guns" from its propaganda arsenal and used its major efforts and functionaries to exploit minority groups, especially the Negro people.

The exploitation of the Negro people by the Communist Party U.S.A. has been graphically detailed by various Negro people who have appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in recent years. Mrs. Julia Brown, a Negro housewife, who unwittingly joined the Communist Party, left shortly thereafter and later rejoined at the request of the FBI, described the fate of a Communist front comprised of Communist and nonparty Negro women. When the party found that the non-Communist Negro women, in sincerely striving to further the cause of civil rights, could not be manipulated by the party, the organization was disbanded. Said Mrs. Brown:

You see, the Negro women were truly trying to fight for civil rights. And the Communists only had civil rights for propaganda.

A Negro resident of Chicago, Miss Lola Belle Holmes, who also joined the Communist Party at the request of the FBI, also learned firsthand of Communist duplicity toward the Negro people.

Miss Holmes stated before the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

They are not concerned with the success of the civil rights movement. They wish oppression and depression of the Negro people to continue so they can have something to drive on, to work on. The Communist Party

cannot be successful without oppression and depression.

Mr. Lucius Armstrong, for many years a Negro member of the Communist Party in Chicago, reentered the Communist Party at the request of the FBI in 1953 and continued in the party as an undercover agent until 1963. Mr. Armstrong told the committee:

The Communist Party is trying to fulfill an objective aim of basic communism that is world domination, and to me a godless concept of humanity.

The foregoing are but a few examples of firsthand experiences of Negroes who learned the hard way just how sincere the Communist Party is in pursuit of civil rights. Information of this nature which alerts those concerned about the progress of civil rights is public information and should be studied by those working in the civil rights field. In 1954, for instance, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report entitled, "The American Negro in the Communist Party," which included the testimony of half a dozen Negroes who had held official positions in the Communist Party and who had broken with it. They had confirmed the fact that the Communist Party does all in its power to promote race hatred and tension—rather than racial equality—in the United States.

One would think that a civil rights leader such as Reverend King would have carefully avoided persons, organizations and causes under the influence of the Communist Party. Unfortunately, the record does not so indicate. Here are some of the organizations and causes in which Communist influence is or was to be found and which elicited from Reverend King more than passing interest.

The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell was cited by HCUA as a Communist front. Reverend King was listed as a sponsor of the committee's National Appeal for Freedom, held in Washington, D.C., November 19–21, 1960.

The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America union was expelled by the CIO in 1949 on grounds of Communist domination. In 1962 Reverend King sent a message to the 27th convention of the UE which was read at the convention by Rev. Morris Dawkins. Reverend King was unable to be present because of activities in Albany, Ga., where he had just been released from jail.

Reverend King was a speaker at a luncheon meeting of a conference held under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers Guild's Committee To Assist Southern Lawyers on November 30 and December 1, 1962, in Atlanta. The National Lawyers Guild has been cited by HCUA as a Communist front.

Another organization which was cited by HCUA in 1961 and to which Reverend King has lent his sponsorship is the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The most recent effort which has been cited by HCUA as a Communist front and which Reverend King has assisted is the Spring Mobilization Committee. This committee, along with the Student Mobilization Committee, were the two groups which planned and organized the

Vietnam Week demonstrations in April of this year. Reverend King spoke at the U.N. Plaza at the culmination of Vietnam Week on April 15. On the same day, it will be remembered, other participants in the demonstration burned the American flag in Central Park.

On other occasions Reverend King has exhibited an affinity for causes or persons influenced by the Communist Party. Carl Braden, identified under oath as a Communist Party member, was convicted of sedition in Kentucky and sentenced to a term of 15 years. After serving several months, Braden was released when the U.S. Supreme Court voided State sedition laws in the Steve Nelson case. In 1961 Braden was convicted of contempt of Congress and the conviction was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. One of a number of initiators of a petition to President Kennedy for executive clemency was Dr. King.

In 1962 Martin Luther King signed a petition to the President asking pardon for Junius Scales. Scales was sentenced to a 6-year term for violation of the Smith Act. He had joined the party in 1940 and in 1947 was made the chairman of the party's North Carolina-South Carolina district. The juries in two court cases had found that Scales knowingly had belonged to an organization which advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by the use of force and violence. He had been a high party functionary and a knowledgeable authority on Communist doctrine. In addition, on at least one occasion at a secret Communist training school, of which Scales was a director and with Scales watching, an instructor taught and demonstrated how a person on a picket line could kill an opponent by stabbing a pencil point into his heart or throat.

The Scales petition signed by Dr. King opposed jail sentences for "men who have sincerely and honestly broken with communism." Scales had claimed that he had left the party in 1957 and cited a letter to that effect which had been published in the Greensboro Daily News on December 18, 1957, 4 years before he began serving his prison term. The sincerity of Scales was certainly open to question when, in the 1940's he insisted publicly that the Communist Party is not dominated by the Soviet Union when the judgments of Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary had made findings to the contrary. Nor could one be blamed for doubting his sincerity in 1955 when he said that "my party has never advocated force and violence," when again all three branches of the Federal Government had found otherwise. In 1961, just before beginning his prison sentence, Scales told an interviewer from the National Guardian that "I can't say that I regret any of it. We did a lot of good things." Presumably, Mr. Scales did not regret the teaching of how to murder with a pencil point.

It is certainly possible that Reverend King was not fully aware of the nature of the organizations and causes listed above. Were he responsible, he would know. However, his endorsement of such efforts, even unwittingly, does not lessen the respectability accruing to these endeavors by the approval of a national

figure. Prudence would seem to demand that before a figure of national prominence sponsors a committee or signs a petition, the nature of the cause and those behind it should be investigated.

It would not take extensive investigation, for instance, to find out the nature of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee—NCAUAC, already mentioned, with which King is associated. One of its founding members, Richard—Dick—Criley, has been identified, as a member of the Communist Party by no less than four former Communists in testimony before HCUA. Another founding member of the NCAUAC, Russell Arthur—Russ—Nixon, goes Criley one better. Nixon has been identified as a member of the party by five former Communists who testified before congressional committees. In all, seven of the 13 founding members of the committee have been identified before congressional committees or by an executive agency as Communists. One of the seven, Reverend William Howard Melish denied under oath that he was a party member. However, the Subversive Activities Control Board found Melish, during the period of his tenure with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was a member of the Communist Party. Still another member of the committee, Frank Wilkinson, was identified as a party member by an undercover agent for the FBI, Anita Schneider. He was convicted of contempt of Congress and was sent to prison when the Supreme Court denied his appeal.

Instead of supporting fronts such as the NCAUAC, Martin Luther King would do well to follow the example of another Negro minister, Rev. James H. Robinson, pastor emeritus of the Presbyterian Church of the Master, New York City, who later became director of Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc. At one time Robinson had determined that he could work along with the Communists to advance the cause of the American Negro without joining the CPUSA. He joined various Communist front efforts when their objectives ostensibly coincided with his own. Eventually, he learned that he was no match for the better organized and disciplined Communist operations and that he could possibly do his cause more harm than good by such associations. In an appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which he himself requested, Robinson was asked if he would allow Communists in his organization, Operation Crossroads Africa. He stated:

I would say the same thing about Communists. I would not let Communists in either. Now, would I let them cooperate with us on anything? No, I would not take that old position of cooperating any more. I would not get involved with people with ulterior motives who really end up trying to use you to make capital for their ends.

The record of Martin Luther King strongly indicates that King has either been grossly irresponsible in learning the backgrounds of some of his associates and associations or that he chooses to use them, as James Robinson did in the past, for his own ends. In any event the up-to-date record of King's activities shows that he still has a vital lesson to

learn. The only other conclusion that a reasonable person can come to is that Martin Luther King has covertly and consciously attempted to promote the cause of the Communist Party.

THE HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL

On the television program, "Meet The Press," on March 28, 1965, the producer and permanent panel member of the show, Lawrence Spivak, referred to a picture taken of King at the Highlander Folk School in 1957 with the accompanying caption, "Martin Luther King at a Communist Training School."

Will you tell us whether that was a Communist training school and what you were doing there?

King replied:

Well, number one I don't think it was a Communist training school. In fact, I know it wasn't. The Highlander Folk School, which was referred to in that particular article, was a school that pioneered in bringing Negroes and whites together at a time when it was very unpopular, to train them for leadership all over the South, and I think they did an able job in doing it. This school was supported by some of the great Americans such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Reinhold Niebuhr, Harry Golden, and many others that I could name.

King went on to say:

Secondly, the fact is that I never attended the school, as far as training goes. I was there about one hour back in 1957 or '8. I went to deliver an address for the 25th Anniversary of the Highlander Folk School. I got there about 15 minutes before I was to speak. I spoke about 45 minutes, and then I left immediately after my speech. I think that is a pretty short period to get any training.

In stating that the school brought Negroes and whites together to train them for leadership, Reverend King overlooked one important consideration—leadership for what? The record shows that Highlander was a safe bet never to win a prize for its Americanism programs.

This well-circulated picture places Martin Luther King at a subversive training school. Four well-known leftists are shown and identified by number.

No. 1. Martin Luther King, Jr.

No. 2. Abner W. Berry, long-time Communist Party functionary; as early as 1938 he gave the report of the Negro Commission of the CP at the 10th National Convention of the Communist Party; later was Negro affairs editor of Daily Worker. His column in the Daily Worker of September 10, 1957, page 5, described the seminar which both he and King attended.

No. 3. Aubrey Williams, board member of Southern Conference for Human Welfare—SCHW—a cited Communist front and president of Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.—SCEF—which replaced SCHW. Senate report found that SCEF had substantially same leadership and purposes of predecessor organization, SCHW. Also affiliated with Highlander Folk School. Identified as a Communist Party member by one witness before Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; another witness identified him as one who accepted the discipline of Communist Party. He denied both charges but admitted that he had been connected with a member of Communist-front organizations.

No. 4. Myles Horton takes credit for starting Highlander Folk School. Like Williams, was a board member of SCHW and became a director of SCEF. One former Communist organizer testified before congressional committee that Horton once remarked, "I am doing you just as much good now as I would if I were a member of the Communist Party."

On February 23, 1961, the New York Times reported that—

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (King's organization) and the Highlander Folk School have joined forces to train Negro leaders for the civil rights struggle.

According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's report, "Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.," released in 1954, Myles Horton, long active in Socialist activities, "identified himself as a teacher at the Highlander Folk School, at Monteagle, Tenn., and said that he assumed the full responsibility for having conceived the idea of the Highlander Folk School and having come down to the Tennessee mountains for the purpose of starting this school."

The Internal Security Subcommittee's report added:

A witness who had been a member of the Communist Party testified that when he was Tennessee district organizer of the Communist Party he made arrangements with Myles Horton and others for the Communist Daily Worker to be sent regularly to the Highlander Folk School, and for a Communist student to go to the Highlander Folk School to recruit students into the Communist Party. The witness further testified that the Highlander Folk School cooperated closely with the Communist Party, and that when he asked Myles Horton to become a member of the Communist Party, Horton replied, "I am doing you just as much good now as I would if I were a member of the Communist Party. I am often asked if I am a Communist Party member and I always say 'No.' I feel much safer in having no fear that evidence might be uncovered to link me with the Communist Party, and therefore I prefer not to become a member of the Communist Party."

Horton was making news even in the 1930's. The Chattanooga Times of January 28, 1935, reported that Myles Horton of "the executive committee of the Socialist Party" was one of those who, "with other Socialists," signed a letter "calling upon State executive committees of all Southern States to hold meetings to effect a united front between Socialists, Communists, and other working class groups and suggesting a revolutionary campaign."

Mr. John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federal of Labor, submitted a report in connection with his public testimony on August 13, 1938, printed in volume 1 of the public hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he makes reference to the Highlander Folk School as follows:

... Elizabeth Hawes, Alton Lawrence, Myles Horton: these three people have been in the past, and probably are now, paid organizers for the Textile Workers Organization Committee. They have been active in radical work in the South and a few years ago attended a secret convention in North Carolina, at which time plans were made for spreading

the revolutionary theories throughout the South.

Regarding Highlander, Mr. Frey stated:

In connection with this we might mention that the Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, was mixed up in this secret convention, in which these three CIO organizers took a very prominent part.

Another person prominent in the Highlander operation was James Dombrowski, who has denied under oath that he was a member of the Communist Party. The "Report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare" which was issued by HCUA in 1947 states:

Dombrowski, together with Myles Horton, a member of the present board of Representatives of the conference, helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united-front movement in the South in 1935.

In 1949 Paul Crouch, testifying before HCUA, was asked if he knew Dombrowski as a member of the Communist Party. He replied:

Not as a member of the Communist Party. I do not know whether he is or is not a member of the Communist Party. He professes to be a left Socialist. I have met officially with him on a number of occasions as head of the Communist District Bureau of Tennessee. He and Myles Horton were present at the conference as Socialists and as representatives of the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn. At this conference Mr. Dombrowski gave me the impression of being completely pro-Communist and anxious to collaborate with the Communist Party and follow its leadership without taking the risk of actual Party membership.

The above-mentioned report, "Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc." also mentioned Dombrowski:

... Dr. Dombrowski was identified by a witness as one who, to the witness's certain knowledge, had been a member of the Communist Party. He was also identified by another witness as one who had accepted Communist Party discipline. Dr. Dombrowski denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever been under Communist discipline, but he admitted that he had been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations...

Also affiliated with the Highlander Folk School was Aubrey W. Williams, also identified in the foregoing Senate subcommittee report as follows:

Aubrey W. Williams was identified as president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., who had been a member of the board of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. He also identified himself as editor and publisher of the Southern Farm and Home, a farm publication. Mr. Williams was identified by a witness as one who had been a member of the Communist Party. He was also identified by another witness as one who accepted the discipline of the Communist Party. Mr. Williams denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever accepted Communist Party discipline, but he admitted that he had been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations.

Williams, according to the Senate subcommittee report, admitted also that on September 11, 1947, he made the following remarks in an address at Madison Square Garden, New York City, with reference to the Government's loyalty program:

What they demand is that any man who admits to being a member of the Communist Party be fired immediately on the grounds that no man can be loyal to the United States and be a Communist. It is my belief that it is precisely at this point that we take our stand and defend the right of any Communist to maintain his position as an employee of the Government of the United States. To take any less position than this is to throw overboard such primary rights as the freedom to think and to hold whatever beliefs one chooses.

In 1963 the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana issued a report entitled "Activities of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., in Louisiana," part I, in which the Highlander Folk School was a subject of inquiry. According to Rev. C. H. Kilby who testified before the joint committee that the forerunner of Highlander was a college called Commonwealth College in Arkansas which was confiscated by the State for nonpayment of fines levied for teaching and advocating communism. According to Rev. Kilby both Horton and Dombrowski were connected with the Arkansas venture, and along with three other individuals founded the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee. The joint committee inserted into the record of its hearings affidavits of three individuals familiar with the Highlander operation who claimed that students were taught that the Russian form of government was to be preferred to our own. Young Communist League membership was solicited and that hammer and sickle insignia were prominently displayed.

According to Reverend Kilby, in 1960 a Tennessee State investigating committee found that the Highlander Folk School was engaging in subversive activities but the statutes of the State of Tennessee contained no laws which would apply. Reverend Kilby testified that a raid was staged on the school by the county sheriff and the Tennessee State Highway Patrol, "and they found that liquor was being sold there without a license, lewdness was being carried out promiscuously, and it was present when they made the raid." The charter of the school was revoked and the property sold at public auction.

The Highlander Folk School was cited as subversive by the Georgia Commission on Education in a special report. Although the school has not been officially cited as a Communist front by any Federal agency, this does not reflect on the Georgia Commission's report in any way.

On May 2, 1962, the Highlander Center, 1625 Riverside Drive, Knoxville, Tenn., issued a press release announcing the opening of the center. Listed among the board of directors is a familiar name—Myles Horton. Concerning the new undertaking, Horton was quoted in The Southern Patriot of January 1963 as saying:

They can confiscate our property, but they can't confiscate our ideas or liquidate our program.

One of the sponsors of the center listed on its letterhead and dated December 12, 1962, is Rev. Martin Luther King.

On October 5, 1963, the offices of the Southern Conference Education Fund in New Orleans, La., were raided by local

and State police who seized a quantity of SCEF's records. The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of Louisiana, already mentioned, prepared a two-volume report on the SCEF after 11 months of investigation and included in the report was material taken from the SCEF files. On page 99, part 1, of the report Jack N. Rogers, committee counsel for the committee, states:

The next document I want to place into evidence, Mr. Chairman, is a copy of the front and back of a photograph found in the files of James A. Dombrowski on October 4. The photograph is a picture of Martin Luther King, Anne Braden, Carl Braden, and James A. Dombrowski, and on the back of the photograph are handwritten notes in the handwriting of James A. Dombrowski as follows: "The 6th Annual Conference of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, September 25 to 28, 1962." Then the people who are in the picture are identified as follows: "Martin Luther King, Jr., responding to Anne Braden's speech; in background, A. B. (Anne Braden), Carl Braden, J.A.D. (James A. Dombrowski)."

According to the Southern Patriot, published by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, a cited Communist front, of March 1963, Martin Luther King "paid high tribute to SCEF" in the course of his remarks at the annual reception of New York Friends of SCEF. The UE News, of October 21, 1963, the publication of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America which was expelled from the CIO on grounds of Communist domination, quoted King as protesting the seizure of SCEF's records in Louisiana and the arrest of two of its top leaders and an attorney.

According to the UE News, King "denounced the attack on the civil rights organization," charging "that there has been a growing effort on the part of opponents of civil rights to charge Communist influence to the movement."

The National Guardian of December 12, 1963, reported that SCEF's attorneys attacked the constitutionality of Louisiana's Communist Control Act and that King was one of five civil rights leaders who filed affidavits in behalf of SCEF in Federal court.

A word of background on the SCEF will put this organization in proper perspective.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings on the SCEF in 1954 and outlined its close relationship with a cited Communist front, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The report of the subcommittee stated that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 as a mass organization to promote communism throughout the Southern States.

Earl Browder, former general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, in a public hearing, identified the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as one of the Communist Party's "transmission belts." On March 29, 1944, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front and, on June

12, 1947, by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The SCEF was initially an adjunct of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. After the exposure of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front, it began to wither and was finally dissolved, but the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., continued. The official paper, the Southern Patriot, was taken over by the SCEF which professes the same ostensible purpose. The Internal Security Subcommittee in its report on the SCEF found that—

An objective study of the entire record compels the conclusion that the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., is operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes as its predecessor organization, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

And who was included among the leadership? Why, Myles Horton and James Dombrowski, of course. Horton was listed as a board member of SCHW and became a director of SCEF. Dombrowski was the "administrator" of SCHW and assumed the office of executive director with SCEF. As previously stated, Aubrey Williams, who had been a board member of SCHW, became the president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.

On page 52, part 2, of the Louisiana Joint Committee's report on the SCEF, there is reproduced a letter by Aubrey Williams dated January 21, 1960, in which he takes credit for bringing Carl Braden and his wife Anne into the SCEF. The pertinent paragraph reads:

I would like to say also, that I was responsible for bringing Carl and Anne Braden into the work of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and that I was then and am now fully informed of their background, previous connections and basic attitudes.

The Bradens are of special interest for 6 years after the above letter by Williams the SCEF announced that James Dombrowski would retire as executive director but remain on the staff as a special consultant while Carl and Anne Braden would take over the work of the executive director. Here are their backgrounds and previous connections which Williams in the above-cited letter stated he was fully informed of.

Anne Braden was identified as a member of the Communist Party U.S.A., by an informant for the FBI, Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, during Carl Braden's sedition case trial in Louisville, Ky., in 1954. Mrs. Braden was also under indictment for sedition in the same case. When the conviction against her husband was nullified by a U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case in 1956, the sedition charges against Anne Braden were dropped.

Mrs. Ahearn appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on October 28, 1957, and testified that Anne

Braden and her husband, Carl, recruited her into the Communist Party, and that both were members of most of her Communist Party cells.

Anne Braden has been affiliated with a number of Communist fronts. Among them are the American Peace Crusade, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Progressive Party, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Civil Rights Congress.

Issues of the Daily Worker in 1954 named Mrs. Braden as a correspondent for Federated Press which has been cited as a Communist-controlled organization.

Articles by Mrs. Braden appeared in the June 1951 and August 1954 issues of March of Labor, also cited as an instrument of the Communist Party.

In the past Anne Braden has edited the Southern Patriot.

The Worker, the Communist Party publication, on January 24, 1965, reported that Anne Braden sent greetings to the 40th anniversary dinner of the International Publishers, the official Communist Party publishing house.

Carl Braden was also identified by Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, the informant for the FBI, as one of those who recruited her into the Communist Party at their home in Louisville, Ky. Mrs. Ahearn appeared before the grand jury in Louisville as a rebuttal witness in the sedition trial of Carl Braden. Braden denied that he was a Communist or that he collected money for the party. The grand jury took over 1,000 pages of testimony from 53 witnesses, the result being that the Bradens, along with one Vernon Bown and others were indicted.

Carl Braden was tried and convicted of sedition, received a 15-year prison sentence and was fined \$5,000. As previously stated, the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case invalidated all State sedition laws and Braden, then in prison awaiting an appeal of his conviction, was freed. Thus, he was freed—not on the merits of his guilt or innocence—but on a Federal-State constitutional question.

The indictment of Braden and the others grew out of a dynamite explosion under a house in a Louisville suburb on Sunday, June 27, 1954. The house at the time was owned and occupied by a man named Andrew Wade IV, a Negro, and his family. On May 10, 1954, the Bradens at Wade's request and with his money, had bought the house in which he was living at the time of the explosion, informing the seller of the house that they intended using it for their own residence. The Wades began moving into the house the next day.

In September of that year a grand jury indicted Vernon Bown, later to be expelled from the Communist Party in 1959, for contempt of court and for placing explosives under a house.

A month later the same grand jury indicted him for sedition. In November a new grand jury indicted Bown for sedition, on the charge of damaging property

to achieve a political end. Also indicted with Bown on this charge were the Bradens, I. O. Ford, and Louis Lubka. Bown and the others were to be tried in November 1956, but the Supreme Court Nelson decision ruled out the pending trial.

Carl Braden appeared as a witness in public hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 30, 1958, and pleaded the first amendment in refusing to answer questions relating to Communist Party membership and other matters. Braden was convicted of contempt of the House of Representatives on January 30, 1959, and was sentenced to 1 year in jail. On March 16, 1959, his motion for a new trial was denied by the U.S. district court in Atlanta. On February 27, 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the contempt conviction of Braden. On May 1, 1961, Braden surrendered to begin serving his 1-year prison term.

It was because of this sentence that a number of initiators directed a petition to President Kennedy seeking Executive clemency. As previously stated, one of the initiators was Martin Luther King.

Like his wife, Carl Braden has a copious supply of Communist-front associations to his credit. He too sent 40th anniversary greetings to the International Publishers, the official Communist Party publishing house. Some of his fronts are: Federated Press, Louisville Peace Crusade, Progressive Party, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, National Assembly for Democratic Rights, National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

On September 14 of this year, four members of the SCEF were dismissed from sedition charges when the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky ruled 2 to 1 that Kentucky's sedition law was both vague and unconstitutional and that sedition was strictly a matter for Federal prosecution. Two of the four SCEF members involved were Carl and Anne Braden. In response to questions, the Bradens denied they had ever been "card-carrying members of the Communist Party," but declined to say whether they had belonged to the party unless the phrase "Communist party membership" was defined.

When one reviews the background of the above-mentioned organizations and individuals and King's willingness to associate with them, it is not surprising that earlier this year, Martin Luther King played a major role in joining the civil rights and peace issues—a vital strategy which the Communist Party has been pursuing here in the United States for some time.

SOME OF KING'S ADVISERS AND ASSOCIATES

When one considers the backgrounds of some of Martin Luther King's advisers and associates, it is hardly surprising that some of King's activities work to the detriment of true civil rights progress and that he ends up mounting the Communist line.

A UPI release of October 10, 1965, reported a meeting which King had with U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg concerning the war in Vietnam. The release stated that "King was accompanied to the meeting by Bayard Rustin, his special consultant," and others.

On February 10, 1966, Director Hoover of the FBI had this to say about Rustin:

At the University of Maryland last year, at a law enforcement institute held for police officers of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., the university invited Bayard Rustin to be one of the speakers. Bayard Rustin was convicted for sodomy, a violation of the Selective Service Act and was an admitted member of the Young Communist League.

In response to a question, Hoover stated that Rustin had admitted sodomy and had been apprehended in Pasadena, Calif. Director Hoover then made this observation:

If they wanted a man to speak on civil rights they could have invited Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, who is a reputable man, or some other responsible racial leader. But to pick out a man who has such a bad background was wrong.

Unfortunately, this is not the only case where the backgrounds and/or activities of some of those close to King certainly harm the civil rights movement in the eyes of the public.

Rev. James L. Bevel, one of King's assistants in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, is another of King's cohorts whose activities certainly do not reflect the sentiments of sincere civil rights exponents. Bevel was a sponsor of Vietnam Week, mentioned above, and was given leave by King to serve as national director of the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, one of two committees which planned and organized Vietnam Week. The House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "Communists are playing dominant roles" in the Spring Mobilization Committee.

Bevel was the signer of a public appeal for funds to furnish the DuBois Clubs "Freedom Center" clubhouse in Chicago and has joined as coplaintiff with the DuBois Clubs in their suit to restrain the Subversive Activities Control Board from holding hearings on the DCA as petitioned by the Attorney General. FBI Director Hoover has publicly stated that the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs were started by the Communist Party U.S.A. as a youth front.

In addition, Bevel was a sponsor of the Chicago conference on December 28 to 30, 1966, to discuss the idea of a nationwide student strike and other forms of demonstrations protesting the U.S. effort to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam. According to the HCUA report, "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week":

Organizers of the conference have openly admitted that representatives of the following Communist organizations took part in the conference: Communist Party U.S.A.; W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America; Progressive Labor Party (the Peking-oriented faction of the U.S. Communist movement); Socialist Workers Party (the Trotskyist Communists); Young Socialist Alliance (youth branch of the Socialist Workers Party); Youth Against War and Fascism (youth arm of the Workers World Party, a Trotskyist splinter group);

National Guardian (published by Weekly Guardian Associates).

To make matters worse, Bevel's wife, Diane Nash Bevel, according to the above-cited HCUA report, recently made an illegal trip to Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, a fact that Negro American soldiers in Vietnam would find hard to reconcile with the civil rights movement.

Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, according to the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 9, 1963, was elected to the presidency of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., and when contacted by the Enquirer in Birmingham, Ala., concerning the nature of the SCEF, stated:

I have the highest regard for this organization (SCEF) for the work it has done since I have been a member of the board, and I have seen nothing on the part of any persons, with whom I have been associated, to give any substantiation to these charges.

Shuttlesworth has been a close associate of Martin Luther King and the New York Times of January 11, 1966, lists him as secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Like King, he has been associated with a number of cited Communist fronts. He was a speaker at the 25th annual convention of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America which, as indicated before, was expelled from the CIO by the 1949 convention on grounds of Communist domination.

When unable to attend, he sent a statement to be read at the rally held by the New York Council To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a cited Communist front.

He was one of 200 guests at the National Guardian's 15th anniversary dinner on November 26, 1964. The Guardian is a cited Communist publication.

It is not surprising that Shuttlesworth is a sponsor of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee and was a speaker at a rally held in Chicago, May 23, 1965, by the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, the midwest regional office of the National Committee To Abolish.

According to the Mine-Mill Union of July 1965, the official publication of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Shuttlesworth was scheduled to speak at the 59th Mine-Mill International Convention, August 16, 1965, in Denver, Colo. This union was expelled by the CIO in 1950 on grounds of Communist domination.

In April 1961, Shuttlesworth took over as pastor of the Negro Revelation Baptist Church in Cincinnati, Ohio. In 1965, 200 members of the 1,100-member church charged that Reverend Shuttlesworth had "conducted the internal affairs of our congregation in an unreasonable and arbitrary manner," according to the New York Times of October 16, 1965. The Washington Post of January 17, 1966, later reported that the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth resigned as pastor of the church after months of bickering. Some members left with him and set up a new church with Mr. Shuttlesworth as its pastor.

The Post item, which was an Associated Press story of January 16, added that:

Mr. Shuttlesworth, a civil-rights leader, was accused by his opponents of being dictatorial and of misusing church funds. Both sides went to court last fall and the minister's foes obtained an injunction to keep him from handling church money.

Reverend Wyatt T. Walker, another of Martin Luther King's associates, also has several Communist fronts listed in his name. In 1962 he was cochairman in charge of conference facilities for a lawyers' conference on civil rights held in Atlanta, under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers Guild's Committee To Assist Southern Lawyers, and the National Bar Association's Civil Rights Committee in cooperation with King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The National Lawyers' Guild, as previously stated, has been cited as a Communist front.

Walker was a sponsor of the Yasui Welcoming Committee which in turn was sponsored by the National Guardian, a Communist front.

As in the case of Shuttlesworth, Walker was a sponsor of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, a Communist front.

Of all those associated with Martin Luther King and the SCLC, perhaps none have had such a close relationship with the Communist Party as Hunter Pitts O'Dell. A UPI release which appeared in the New York Times of July 27, 1963, reported that King stated that O'Dell had worked twice for the SCLC. King acknowledged that O'Dell "may have had some connections in the past" with communism but King added that:

We were convinced that he had renounced them and had become committed to the Christian philosophy of nonviolence in dealing with America's social injustices.

King said O'Dell left the movement on June 26 by "mutual agreement" because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used by "segregationists and race-baiters."

The surest indication of O'Dell's break with the Communist Party would be, of course, his willingness to appear before a congressional committee and give the U.S. Government the benefit of his party experience. Indications are that O'Dell could be of immense help in disclosing the identities of 20th-century Benedict Arnolds biding their time for the downfall of the United States.

In 1956 O'Dell testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He invoked the fifth amendment and refused to say if he was a southern district organizer for the Communist Party. Robert Morris, counsel for the subcommittee, said information had been received that O'Dell was, in fact, a district organizer for the Communist Party in New Orleans, and that O'Dell gave "directives to the professional group" in that city and that he operated under three different names—the other two being John Vesey and Ben Jones.

On July 30, 1958, O'Dell appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this time invoking both the first and fifth amendments in refusing to answer questions about his Communist activities.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR NEW POLITICS

The latest venture to which Martin Luther King lent his name was the National Conference for New Politics which held its convention at the Palmer House in Chicago, August 29 through September 4. King was listed as a member of its national council, and on August 31 he gave the keynote speech. In attendance were those against the war in Vietnam, black power advocates, some civil rights workers, the new left, observers from the Communist Party and representatives from a number of other leftist organizations. The purpose of the convention was to coordinate the efforts of liberal and radical groups in political action. There had been talk that a King-Spock ticket would head a third-party movement in 1968. What happened to this proposal was described by Chesly Manly in the Chicago Tribune, August 27, 1967:

The N.C.N.P. steering committee had decided to permit a free convention decision on the question of running King and Spock on a third party ticket. Preliminary soundings had disclosed majority support in the various components of the so-called "new politics" movement for a third party effort in 1968. At the request of the Communist party, however, the steering committee reconsidered the question, at a meeting attended by Johnson (Arnold Johnson, member of national board of Communist Party) in the Palmer House, July 29 and 30 and agreed on parliamentary maneuvers which are expected to prevent a decision by the convention in favor of a third party.

The New York Daily News of August 31 carried an article by Chesly Manly which also referred to the NCNP. An excerpt from this article comments on Communist Party participation:

Federal and local security officers, who are closely watching proceedings of the convention, said several hundred other known Communists will attend as delegates or observers of Communist "front" groups and other far left organizations affiliated with the conference.

From all appearances the convention turned out to be a colossal flop. The Chicago Tribune of September 6 commented that the convention "turned out to be an assembly of crackpots and innocent dogooders who meekly did the bidding of a handful of black power fanatics and Communists." Even Norman Thomas, a radical of long standing, described the convention as "black apartheid" and said he wanted nothing to do with it.

The Palmer House, where many of the delegates to the convention stayed, suffered more than \$10,000 in damages as a result of the convention. The Chicago Tribune, September 7, carried the story of the vandalism which was told to the Tribune by informed sources. Not only were furnishings and fittings of the historic hotel damaged, but items ranging from linens to public address system microphones were plundered.

At least two marihuana parties were staged as well as several gatherings in which sex orgies were held before audiences of delegates. Some delegates skipped out on room service and other bills, while others wrote the words "black power" and obscenities on the walls of hallways and rooms. The words "black power" and obscenities were carved into

expensive bronze doors on virtually all of the 15 elevators in the hotel.

At elevator entrances on various upper floors, observers reported heavy ash tray urns had been smashed and the legs of tables and other furnishings broken. Light fixtures on the walls of corridors had been torn free or bent. Carpeting in some rooms was gashed. According to the Tribune account one representative was slugged on the head with an empty whisky bottle by a colleague, and "two other out-of-town delegates—one of them the son of a top Communist Party leader—were robbed at knife point." One sentence from NCNP literature perhaps explains best the excesses mentioned above:

The National Conference for New Politics (N.C.N.P.) will serve and reinforce the *autonomous local expressions* of the New Politics.

RIGHT DOWN THE COMMIE LINE

April 4, 1967, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., rose to the speaker's platform in New York City's Riverside Church and delivered what must surely be the greatest condemnation of American policy and involvement in Vietnam ever to come from a well-known citizen. His attack was ruthless, packed with misleading innuendoes and distortions. A Presidential aide was later quoted: "a speech on Vietnam that goes right down the Commie line."

More and more, King has been branching out from civil rights into the field of foreign affairs. More and more he parrots the far left, pro-Communist line.

In mid-1966, King announced that he would write to Ho Chi Minh, leaders of the U.S.S.R., South Vietnam, and the United States in an effort to bring the war to the conference table. This in itself would seem to be another violation of law. Later that year he called for admission of Red China to the United Nations and negotiations with the Vietcong. At that time, columnist Max Freedman asked:

Is he casting about for a role in Vietnam because the civil rights struggle is no longer adequate to his own estimate of his talents?

If there was any doubt, the April 4 speech washed it away. In this speech, King lashed out at the United States, called our Nation "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," charged the Nation with "cruel manipulation of the poor" and, as if written by the Daily Worker, said that U.S. troops "may have killed a million South Vietnamese civilians—mostly children." Keep in mind that these are only selections from the speech.

This speech and his involvement with the Vietnam Week protests brought down on King's head an abundance of denunciations, from civil rights leaders, legislators, military men, journalists and many Negroes who believe King has gone way, way too far.

King's Riverside speech is a hideous perversion of fact, a perversion nearly without limits. He said that Americans "poison the water" of the South Vietnamese. He stated that "we kill a million acres of their crops" and that American bulldozers "destroy their precious trees"

and that "they wander into the hospitals with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for each Vietcong-inflicted injury." These are King's words. To this array of absurdities he added:

We test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe.

These are a few of the Communist-line invectives which King delivered on April 4. Since they were spoken, various "transcripts" of the speech have appeared "cleansed" versions brought forward in an apparent attempt to soothe the irate response of the great majority of Americans.

Some of the "clean" texts have omitted the statement about killing a million South Vietnamese, "mostly children." Some of the texts have footnotes by King denying that he meant to compare the United States and Nazi Germany. But the true speech has been torn apart, and King with it, by all who care for fact rather than fiction and by those who deplore King's linking anti-Vietnam and civil rights.

For all his vocal attempts to keep his anti-Vietnam stand and civil rights separate, and on a "personal" basis, these attempts have not worked. There is a joining of the two and King has helped direct it.

At the 1966 annual meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the group condemned the war, called it mass murder and authorized King to "throw the resources" of the organization behind efforts to end the war. It was at this time that King said he would write to the leaders of the governments involved. Doubtless, he dropped the idea when someone told him that the Logan Act, which he would have violated, forbids an individual from dealing in this way with a foreign government.

King maintains that he has never advocated a "mechanical merger" of the civil rights and peace organizations—which at other times he says are inextricably bound together—but, mechanical or not, he did release the Reverend James Bevel from the SCLC to head the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. Incidentally, Bevel's wife, Diane, not long ago got back from a Hanoi pilgrimage, so that helps understand the Bevels. And he did have the backing and resources of the SCLC—at one time, at least, a civil rights group—and he did state that he expected to be able to use a "trained field staff" of about 200 persons, mostly "experienced civil rights and peace organizers" in an attempt to get 10,000 volunteers and spread his "Vietnam Summer" throughout the Nation. Add to this the fact that the SCLC called on President Johnson to abandon the Ky government early in 1966.

The key word here is "mechanical," but it is not relevant. The example points up the typical semantic maneuvering of Dr. King. While he maintains that there should be no "mechanical merger," he achieves a merger in actuality of the parts he controls by grabbing off selected civil rights participants and resources and directing them to his new crusade.

The results of this linking has been the loss of whatever prestige King had, but more importantly, the loss to legitimate Negro aspirations for equal rights.

AFTERMATH OF A "TACTICAL ERROR"

The statements on Vietnam by Dr. King have been refuted to a degree unseen before. The NAACP board of directors termed King's movement into the vocal antiwar camp as "a serious tactical mistake." The directors said the effort to fuse the two "will serve the cause neither of civil rights nor of peace."

Civil rights battles will have to be fought on their own merits, irrespective of the state of war or peace in the world. We are not a peace organization nor a foreign policy association. We are a civil rights organization. . . . We are, of course for a just peace. But there already exist dedicated organizations whose number one task is to work for peace just as our number one job is to work for civil rights.

Criticism has also come from other civil rights-conscious Negro leaders. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche stated:

Right now, I am convinced he is making a very serious tactical error which will do much harm to the civil rights struggle.

Thurgood Marshall said King had a right to criticize the war, but "not as a civil rights leader. If he is trying to line the civil rights struggle with Vietnam he is leading the movement in the wrong direction. I do not believe he speaks for the majority of civil rights leaders or the majority of Negroes."

Dean Joseph O'Meara of the University of Notre Dame Law School was reported to have said, referring to Dr. King, among others, that they are "either Communists or traitors or cowards. Or they are persons of large good will but little insight who have been euechered into being stooges, or who are seeking some end of their own—ambition, revenge or whatever—at the expense of their country. Such persons are doing irreparable harm to the cause of civil rights by seeking to link the civil rights movement with their own criminal attempts to persuade young men to avoid military service."

The Reverend Matthew L. Winters says of King's stand:

When Dr. Martin Luther King says "the United States is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world," I take issue with him . . . China, Hungary, Korea, the Baltic countries . . . Communism cannot be stopped by guns alone. I believe that. But there are times, when, God help us, it is the only way.

NEITHER HAWK NOR DOVE, BUT PIGEON

The New York Times reported May 21, 1967:

Freedom House severely criticized King for lending his "mantle or respectability" to an anti-Vietnam war coalition that included "well-known Communist allies and luminaries of the hate-America left." The position paper said King "emerged as the public spear-carrier of a civil disobedience program that is demagogic and irresponsible in its attacks on our government."

In his retort to Freedom House, King told the Associated Press:

It is totally untrue and unwarranted for anyone to give the impression that the (peace) mobilization was dominated by Communists or inspired by Communists.

Contrast this to the conclusion of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the Vietnam Week demonstrations where King was a main speaker in front of the U.N. Plaza on the 15th of April, and to which he refers:

The committee . . . charged today that Communists are the principal organizing force behind extensive demonstrations to take place during Vietnam Week, April 8-15.

Dr. King says that "we cannot separate the two," meaning separate civil rights and peace movements. If this is true, and it is what he appears to be striving for, I turn to the House Committee for clarification of what this means. From its lengthy, factual report on Vietnam Week the committee reports:

Dr. Martin Luther King's agreement to play a leading role in the April 15 demonstrations in New York City, and his freeing Rev. James Bevel from his key position in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to head up the Spring Mobilization Committee, are evidence that the Communists have succeeded, at least partially, in implementing their strategy of fusing the Vietnam and Civil Rights issues in order to strengthen their chances of bringing about a reversal of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The House committee documents that Spring Mobilization Committee locked arms with the Student Mobilization Committee which "grew out of a conference in Chicago last December, called by Bettina Aptheker of the Communist Party's National Committee." This Chicago conference was studded with luminaries from the Communist Party in the United States.

King stated to the assembled at Riverside Church:

We are taking black young men who have been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they have not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem.

Negro Columnist Carl T. Rowan answers that a "recent Harris survey showed that almost one of every two Negroes believes that King is wrong—and another 27 percent reserved judgment."

To the charges by Dr. King that Negroes in South Vietnam are mercenaries and the charges against U.S. policy, Capt. Earle McCaskill, as assistant judge advocate in Vietnam, and as a 29-year-old Negro lawyer, replies:

I think what they (King and other war protesters) have done is unfortunate. They demonstrated their lack of understanding of what we're doing here. King talks about a civil war, but anyone who's fought in Vietnam knows that the whole thing is being run by Hanoi.

He says that King and others in the antiwar faction have missed the point, "a critically important point. . . . In a way, the war puts the movement in focus. What we are trying to accomplish here is to guarantee personal liberty, economic opportunities and educational opportunities for everyone—the peasants and the sons of bankers—and that is what we Negroes need in the States."

In an interview with the New York Times, King started the buildup for the day when he may have to condone civil disobedience in the antiwar forces. He has already told young men to examine their draft status and think about conscientious objection. Here is King's lead-in to full-scale disobedience.

Now if our nation insists on escalating the war and if we don't see any changes it may be necessary to engage in civil disobedience to further arouse the consciences of the nation and make it clear we feel this is hurting our country.

Possibly one of the most ridiculous of King's statement came when he talked about the diversion of "attention" from civil rights to the war in Vietnam. He said:

The U.S. involvement in Vietnam has diverted attention from civil rights and excited violence and hatred among our people.

And what has King done with his malicious speeches, his threats and his talk of civil disobedience?

Roy Wilkins, respected leader of the NAACP, gives an answer:

I don't believe Dr. King . . . as a leader in the civil rights movement, has the right to mix up the civil rights fight with the Viet Nam fight. . . .

By involving himself in the peace movement, King indicates that Viet Nam is number one on his agenda and civil rights is either number three, four or five.

I feel civil rights is number one.

I don't speak as a hawk or a dove. I speak as a civil rights person and I don't want anyone to get in the way whether it be Martin Luther King or Lurleen Wallace. But is it wrong for people to be patriotic? Is it wrong for us to back up our boys in the field?

They're dying while we're knifing them in the back at home.

Maybe I'm a bit old fashioned. Maybe we are wrong, maybe we shouldn't be in Vietnam. But when you're out there in the trenches being fired at, you have to fight back.

CONCLUSIONS

In November 1964, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover called Reverend King "the most notorious liar in the country." Mr. Hoover spoke with no small amount of authority or knowledge. King has avoided a direct encounter with the famed public servant because the record is clearly unfavorable to the civil rights leader. Mr. Hoover is privy to many confidential reports on Mr. King's activities just as I am, and while their nature cannot be disclosed, I can say without equivocation that Martin Luther King does not want nor can he stand a public airing of his record. I can rest my case against King with the public utterances and actions of this man and any revelation of confidential matters is entirely unnecessary.

Why has he been immune for so many years and, in the parlance of the day, "allowed to get by with murder?" There is a peculiar double standard which the liberal community consistently applies. If any prominent person, particularly a conservative, were to identify with or share a speakers' platform with a member of the John Birch Society or some group the liberals might currently be attacking, he would be maligned forever. Let Martin Luther King openly identify with Communists and radicals, have a Communist as an adviser, engage in criminal activity, appear at the most way-out meetings in the Nation and advocate racism, revolution or civil disobedience and these same people look the other way.

In the long run, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we do not have to worry that much about the Martin Luther Kings.

Our society is open enough, free enough, and resilient enough that it can withstand demagoguery. What is frightening, however, is to see the usual guardians of the public interest, ranging from the press to the Justice Department, look the other way and virtually assure such people a green light in their operations.

The press has repeatedly referred to Reverend King as a moderate. He is not. While he is not telling Negroes to arm themselves with guns or to "burn, baby, burn" like the Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichaels, he is, in a sophisticated way, agitating for the same thing. He is going to have a massive dislocation of northern cities but no violence. He says that upsetting a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot, whatever that means. This is the enigma of Martin Luther King. He preaches nonviolence but somehow this can end up in illegal or violent actions. Then he says he is not responsible, although he himself has often participated in illegal acts.

He has thrust himself into community after community where even the Negro leaders have asked him to stay away. Only this year, King again foisted himself into the Chicago turmoil and announced his own brand of solutions to their ills. Rev. Henry Mitchell, a leader in the area King chose as a "target" asked him to leave and charged that King "created hate." King has thrust himself onto the Cleveland, Ohio, scene and promoted a boycott of a local dairy. In that particular case, he cited as some demands on that firm actions which could be a violation of the civil rights law. He also said the firm must advertise in Negro newspapers and put money in Negro savings and loan associations to avoid a Negro boycott. All in all, this is the blackmail tactic of a would-be dictator and power-hungry demagog, not a responsible leader.

By word and deed, he has been a potent force for lawlessness in our country. He has been a scoundrel. He has arrogated to himself the right to pick and choose the laws he will obey. He has set a poor example for others to emulate. He has countenanced draft evasion. He has been disloyal to his own country.

In an age when our country needs statesmen and builders, he has been a demagog and wrecker. Many of his ideas are alien to our way of life. In America, he can constitutionally say virtually anything he wants and command any following that he can muster for legitimate pursuits. It is important, however, that he be understood in his true perspective so honest and well-meaning Americans will not be duped because they did not fully understand the man, his mission, and his tactics.

LEAVES OF ABSENCES

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EILBERG, for October 4 after 3 p.m. and October 5 and 6, on account of observance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. MULTER, for October 4 after 3 p.m., and October 5 and 6, on account of ob-

servance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. TENZER, for October 4 after 3 p.m., and October 5 and 6, on account of observance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of October 9, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 20 minutes, tomorrow, October 5; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 60 minutes, on October 10; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. WALDIE), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. FLOOD to revise and extend his remarks made on conference report on H.R. 10196 and to include certain tables.

Mr. MACHEN to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 10196 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY to include extraneous matter during his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEE.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting listings of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Supply Agency contracts negotiated under sections 2304(a) (11) and 2304(a) (16) for the period January-June 1967, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1142. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions program, equipment, and facilities, for the quarter ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1143. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions, personnel, and administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to subsection 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1144. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the duty-free entry of gifts, not exceeding \$50 in retail value, from members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 730. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3274. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold (Rept. No. 731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10583. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 12601. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 939. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7977, a bill to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 734). Referred to the House Calendar.